

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated September 28, 2007.

Claims 1-42 are in the application. Claims 26-42 have been withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner. Claims 1, 5 and 13 have been amended. Claims 1, 13, 26, 36 and 38 are independent. Favorable review is respectfully requested.

A replacement sheet of drawings is submitted herewith, to be substituted for the corresponding sheet now on file in the application. The replacement sheet, comprising Figure 9, points out the central site and ingest queue server 926 more clearly. No new matter has been added.

Claim 5, dependent from system claim 1, has been amended to recite a system instead of a method.

Claim 1, which is directed to a system comprising remote sites and a central site, has been amended to recite an ingest server configured to receive digital content uploaded from a client. An ingest queue server at a central site, geographically remote from the remote sites, directs transfer of digital content from the ingest server to one or more of first servers at the remote site, based on client identifying information. Claim 13, directed to a method for facilitating access by users to digital content of one or more clients, has been amended to recite the steps of uploading the digital content to an ingest server at a remote site, and directing transfer of digital content from the ingest server to another server at the remote site based on the client identifying information. This amended claim language is supported in the specification at least at paragraphs 165-168, with reference to Figures 9 and 10.

Claims 1-4, 6, 9-16, 18 and 21-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Hans et al. (U.S. Pat. Application Publication No. 2002/0120577). The applicants respectfully submit that amended independent claims 1 and 13 are patentably distinct from the cited art, for the following reasons.

Hans et al. is understood to disclose a content management system in which a geographically separated content manager, a content provider and a user all communicate with each other (see Hans et al., Figures 1 and 2). According to Hans et al., digital content may be

transmitted from a content provider node to a user node if authorized by an access manager (Hans et al., paragraph 29, and Figure 5). Hans et al. is concerned with whether the end user is licensed or authorized to obtain the digital content, and treats the content as already existing at (or originating from) a remote content provider server. Hans et al. offers no teaching or suggestion regarding uploading of content from a client to a remote site, and in particular does not teach or suggest an ingest server at a remote site. It follows that Hans et al. does not and cannot suggest an ingest queue server at a central site to direct transfer of digital content from the ingest server to one or more servers (first servers) at the remote site. Hans et al. merely teaches authorizing transmissions from a content provider node to a user node, as opposed to teaching how content from a client should be efficiently placed at a remote site.


Claims 5 and 7, dependent from claim 1, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hans et al. in view of Layeghi (U.S. Pat. Application Publication No. 2002/0019823). Claims 7 and 19, dependent from claims 1 and 13 respectively, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hans et al. in view of Colby (U.S. Pat. Application Publication No. 2002/0019823). Claims 8 and 20, dependent from claims 1 and 13 respectively, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hans et al. in view of Mutton (U.S. Pat. Application Publication No. 2002/0147840). None of the additional cited references disclose or suggest an ingest server or ingest queue server as recited in claim 1, or uploading content to an ingest server and directing transfer of content from the ingest server to another server at a remote site, as recited in claim 13. Accordingly, none of the additional references remedies the above-described defects of Hans et al. as a reference against claims 1 and 13. Independent claims 1 and 13 thus are not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Layeghi, Colby or Mutton, considered either alone or in combination with Hans et al.

The other claims now under consideration in this application are dependent from one or the other of the independent claims discussed above and are believed to be patentable for the same reasons. Since each claim is deemed to define a separate aspect of the invention, however, consideration of each claim on its merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, favorable consideration and early passage to issue of this application are respectfully requested.

The applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached by telephone at 212-801-6729. All correspondence should continue to be directed to the address listed below, which is the address associated with Customer Number 76058.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'James J. DeCarlo', is written over the text 'Respectfully submitted,'.

James J. DeCarlo
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 36,120

Greenberg Traurig, LLP
MetLife Building
200 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10166

Date: December 20, 2007

NY 238,619,058v1 12/20/2007




FIG. 9